

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 02/02/2011.
2. Claims 1-9, 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-70 are pending in this application. As per the Instant Amendment:
 - a. Claims 44-70 have been added;
 - b. Claims 10, 12-27, 35, 37, and 39 were cancelled;
 - c. Claims 1, 7-8, 11, and 28-33 have been amended; and
 - d. Claims 1, 45, 46, 52, 55, 58, 63, and 66 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 07/18/2011 and 01/07/2012 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Examiner Notes

4. As mentioned in section 19 of the Office Action mailed on 01/19/2010 and section 19 d) of the Office Action mailed on 09/02/2010, the amended specifications submitted on 11/09/2009 and 06/10/2009 are objected to and have not been entered since they do not conform to 37 CFR 1.121 and 37 CFR 1.125 (*See MPEP § 608.01(q) and § 714.19*). The Examiner respectfully suggests that said amended specifications be further revised to conform to 37 CFR 1.121 and 37 CFR 1.125 so that they can be entered. Because the amended specifications, filed on 06/10/2009 and 11/09/2009, have not been entered, any

Art Unit: 2174

subsequence amendments would not be entered. As a result, the instant amended specification submitted on 02/02/2011 will not be entered.

5. In addition to the above, it is noted that the instant amended specification submitted on 02/02/2011 are objected to as new subject matters are added to the specification (*see pages 5-6; following are some examples “lose effectiveness when an online meeting,” “A file is Portable Document Format,” “Visual Digital document,” “Visually compound digital text document,” etc.,*). It is requested that the all new subject matters be canceled. (*See MPEP § 2163.06*). Also as addressed in the MPEP § 2163.06, *“If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement. In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).”*

Election by Original Presentation

6. Newly added and current amended claims directed to invention that are independent or distinct species from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
- a. **Species 1:** Claims 1-9, 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-51 directed to a display unit to display a graphical user interface for manipulating access control setting and access log information for a specific visual digital document.
 - b. **Species 2:** Claims 52-62 directed to a display unit to display a graphical user interface for manipulating access control setting and access log information for a specific Portable Document Format document.

Art Unit: 2174

- c. **Species 3:** Claims 63-70 directed to a display unit to display a graphical user interface for manipulating access control setting and access log information for a specific compound digital text document.
7. The species are independent or distinct because the aforementioned species are mutually exclusive.
8. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 52-62 and 63-70 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

9. As mentioned in sections 3-4 above, as the Applicants continue amending the specification wherein previous amendments have not been entered, this is make more difficult for the prosecution. The amended specifications submitted on 11/09/2009 and 06/10/2009 are objected to and have not been entered because they do not conform to 37 CFR 1.121 and 37 CFR 1.125 (See MPEP § 608.01(q) and § 714.19); (*See Office Actions mailed on 01/19/2010 and 09/02/2010*).
10. The rejections of claims 1-12, 28-34, and 36-43 are maintained as the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The claims call for "*A visual display unit;*" However, there is no hardware component/element found within the bodies of the claims. The bodies of the

claims 1 and 45 recites “*one or more display region on the display unit;*” In light of the specification (*paragraphs [0029] and [0033]-[0041]*), the aforementioned units/components/features are implemented in software, which are non-statutory subject matter. Therefore, the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101. The Examiner respectfully suggests that the claims be further amended to positively recite at least one hardware element within the body of the claim to make the claim statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In addition to the above, as the invention is directed to a software application to provide a graphical user interface for managing/integrating access control to digital document; it is suggested that the claims should be directed to a software application/product instead of a display unit/device.

11. Applicants’ arguments in the instant Amendment, filed on 02/02/2011 with respect to limitations listed below, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues: “*Amended claims now recite hardware within the body of the claims.*”

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. The Examiner respectfully submits that the claimed limitation “*display unit*” is not limited to hardware embodiment. As discussed in the specification, paragraphs [0029] and [0033]-[0041], the aforementioned units/components/features are implemented in software. Therefore, the display unit could be a software component. As a result, the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner respectfully suggests that the claim be further

Art Unit: 2174

amended to positively recite at least one hardware element to make the claim statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

b. Applicant argues: Sekiguchi fails to disclose “*log information for a single specific predetermined digital document.*”

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. The Examiner respectfully submits that Sekiguchi does disclose “log information for a single specific predetermined digital document” (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document [i.e., file1.txt, file2.txt, exec.exe, etc.,]; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that when a user searches for log information of a single specific predetermined digital document, such as “file1.txt,” it is clear that the log file 203 provides sufficient log information for the single specific predetermined digital document: file1.txt. Therefore, Sekiguchi does disclose all limitations argued above.

c. Applicant argues: “*Barkley does not teach displaying document content.*”

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. The Examiner respectfully submits that Barkley does disclose “[displaying] normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the document” (*col. 8, lines 44-65; col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; file name and file path are displayed on Role/Group Permission view; Fig. 5; file ‘ko.acc’*). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that file name and file path are representation of the content of the document. Therefore, Barkley does disclose limitations argued above.

Art Unit: 2174

d. Applicant argues: *“Hildebrand apparently neither teaches user interface for showing or setting specific access control settings per user nor per document.”*

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. The Examiner respectfully submits that Hildebrand does teach a user interface for showing and setting specific access control settings for user (*Hildebrand: pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; such as user A may be an executive or a branch supervisor who has all the access privileges to any secured documents, user B has limited access privileges while everyone in user group C shares the same access privilege*). One of ordinary skill in the art would realize that by using AdmGrp GUI 275, the administrator could assign different access privileges to different users; where a default rights for files in the group are specified in checked-boxes 277. It is clear that Hildebrand does disclose all limitations argued above.

e. Applicant argues: *“Apparently no document content is shown in user interface.”*

The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant. The Examiner respectfully submits that Hayes does disclose document content is shown in the user interface (*Hayes: col. 3, lines 38-45; uses a unique identifier to access the file; which is known as a digital document, from the server; Figs. 13-22; showing one or more display regions; such as a contents of the applets 1300 are displayed on the left panel [i.e., items 1306 and 1308]*). It is clear that Hayes does disclose all limitations argued above.

The Examiner respectfully suggests that the claim be further amended, details in the specification be incorporated, to distinguish the claimed invention over prior art of record. Should the Applicant desire an interview to further clarify the claim

Art Unit: 2174

interpretation/rejections, please contact the Examiner at (571) 270 3230 to schedule an interview.

Specification

12. The instant amended specification submitted on 02/02/2011 are objected to as new subject matters are added to the specification (*see pages 5-6; following are some examples “lose effectiveness when an online meeting,” “A file is Portable Document Format,” “Visual Digital document,” “Visually compound digital text document,” etc.,*). It is requested that the all new subject matters be canceled. (*See MPEP § 2163.06*). Also as addressed in the MPEP § 2163.06, *“If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement. In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).”*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

13. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

14. **Claims 1-9, 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101** because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 1, 45, and 46; the claims call for *“A visual display unit;”* however, there is no hardware component/element found within the bodies of the claims.

Art Unit: 2174

The bodies of the claims 1 and 45 recite “*display region on the display unit;*” In light of the specification, (*paragraphs [0029] and [0033]-[0041]*), the aforementioned units/components/features are implemented in software, which are non-statutory subject matter. Therefore, the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The mere recitation of the machine in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101. The Examiner respectfully suggests that the claims be further amended to recite at least one hardware element within the body of the claim to make the claim statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In addition to the above, as the invention is directed to a software application to provide a graphical user interface for managing/integrating access control to digital document; it is suggested that the claims should be directed to a software application/product instead of a display unit/device.

Regarding claims 2-9, 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-51; claims 2-9, 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-51 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter for the same reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2174

16. **Claims 11, 28-34, 36, 38, and 40-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- **Regarding claims 45-46**; the claims recite the limitation “essentially at most one time;” in lines 6 and 7-8 respectively; (emphasis added). Said limitation is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term “*essentially at most one time*” is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. As a result, the aforementioned limitation is found indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- **Regarding claims 11, 28-34, 36, 38, 40-44, and 47-51**; claims 11, 28-34, 36, 38, 40-44, and 47-51 are dependent on either claim 45 or 46, and therefore inherit the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph issues of the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2174

18. **Claims 1-2, 4, 7-8, 33, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Barkley et al., ("Barkley," U.S. 6,202,066), issued on March 13, 2001.

- **Regarding claim 1**, Barkley discloses a visual display unit which displays a graphical user interface for representing and facilitating user manipulation of persistent yet revocable access control settings for a specific predetermined visual digital document (*col. 8, lines 44-55; Figs. 2-5*) comprising:

one or more display regions on the display unit for graphical representations of all persistent yet revocable access control settings for the specific predetermined visual digital document (*col. 10, lines 56-67; Figs. 2-5; Read, Write, Execute, and Delete permissions check-boxes are displayed on the Role/Group Permission View window; Fig. 5; file 'ko.acc'*), wherein the graphical representations result from transformations applied to the structured data which defines the access control settings for the document (*col. 10, lines 56-67 and col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; as displayed on fig. 5, financial advisor user has read permission on file 'ko.acc' and does not have write, execute, and delete permission on the 'ko.acc' file*); and

a display region on the display unit for normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the document (*col. 8, lines 44-65; col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; file name and file path are displayed on Role/Group Permission view; Fig. 5; file 'ko.acc'*);

wherein the set of display regions for representations of the access control settings and the display region for representation of the content of the document are concurrently visible, are concurrently operable, and appear to the operator as in an integrated graphical user interface (*col. 12, lines 50-67 to col. 13, lines 1-11; col. 13,*

lines 19-61; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; as displayed on fig. 5, financial advisor user has read permission on file ko.acc and does not have write, execute, and delete permission on the 'ko.acc' file).

- **Regarding claim 2**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1, wherein one or more functions modify the spatial layout of the display regions for representations of the access control settings (*col. 10, lines 56-67; col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; Read, Write, Execute, and Delete permissions checkboxes*).

- **Regarding claim 4**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1, wherein one or more functions modify the transformations that are applied to the structured data (*col. 6, lines 8-12; col. 8, lines 56-65; col. 9, lines 48-60; Figs. 3 and 5; hierarchy checkbox*).

- **Regarding claim 7**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1, wherein the set of display regions further comprises:

a display region for a graphical representation of the result of transforming the set of groups, users and roles and their respective access privileges into a corresponding set of individual users and their respective effective access privileges (*col. 9, lines 8-47; col. 10, lines 56-6; col. 11, lines 1-56; col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; role/group permission hierarchy*).

- **Regarding claim 8**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1, further comprising a first display region for a graphical

Art Unit: 2174

representation of at least one set of known users and groups, wherein the operator can designate indicia for known users and groups and visually associate the designated indicia with a second display region to change the structured data which defines the access control settings for the document (*col. 9, lines 8-47; col. 10, lines 56-6; col. 11, lines 1-56; col. 13, lines 19-60; Figs. 2, 4, and 5; role/group permission hierarchy*).

- **Regarding claim 33**, Barkley teaches the graphical user interface of claim 8, wherein the set further comprising access control settings macros and the operator can designate indicia for macros and visually associate the designated indicia with the second display region to change the structured data which defines the access control settings for the document (*col. 10, lines 5-45; Figs. 4-5; hierarchy mode option; Role/Group Permission can be obtained through operation of a hierarchy, i.e., where one role automatically inherits the permissions of another*).

- **Regarding claim 44**, Barkley teaches the visual display unit of claim 7, wherein the set of display regions comprises a display region for a graphical representation of the set of groups, users and roles defined by existing structured data for the document and their respective access privileges (*col. 10, lines 5-45; Figs. 4-5; hierarchy mode option; Role/Group Permission can be obtained through operation of a hierarchy, i.e., where one role automatically inherits the permissions of another*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2174

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Barkley, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Gottsacker et al., (“Gottsacker,” US 2004/0135805).

- **Regarding claim 3**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1.

Barkley does not explicitly disclose one or more functions modify the number of the display regions for representations of the access control settings.

However, in an analogous art, Gottsacker discloses a document composition system, wherein one or more functions modify the number of the display regions for representations of the access control settings (*Gottsacker: par. 0016; system administrators are able to customize the appearance of the GUI*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention were made to combine the teachings of Gottsacker with the method of Barkley to provide users with a mean for allowing system administrator to customize the appearance of the GUI (*Gottsacker: par. 0016*).

21. **Claims 5, 34, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Barkley, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Lee et al., (“Lee,” US 2004/0117194).

- **Regarding claim 5**, Barkley discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 1.

Barkley does not explicitly disclose a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user.

However, in an analogous art, Lee discloses a network conferencing system, wherein a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user (*par. 0017; Figs. 4A, 12, 14, and 18; attendance icons*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention were made to combine the teachings of Lee with the method of Barkley to provide users with a mean for displaying attendance icon within a network conference (*Lee: par. 0017*).

- **Regarding claim 34**, claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

- **Regarding claim 36**, claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

- **Regarding claim 38**, claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

22. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Barkley in view of Lee, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Steinberg, (US 2002/0141639).

- **Regarding claim 6**, Barkley and Lee disclose the visual display unit of claim 5.

Barkley and Lee do not explicitly disclose adjusting image color saturation toward a predetermined target saturation level; converting to grayscale; adjusting image brightness toward a predetermined target brightness level; adjusting image contrast toward a predetermined target contrast level; adjusting image sharpness toward a predetermined target sharpness level; and masking with a shape selected from a set comprising ovals and outlines of a bust.

However, Steinberg teaches a method for automated image correction for digital image acquisition wherein adjusting image color saturation toward a predetermined target saturation level (*Steinberg: par. 0004; pars. 0015-0016*);

converting to grayscale (*Steinberg: par. 0011*);

adjusting image brightness toward a predetermined target brightness level (*Steinberg: pars. 0012-0014*);

adjusting image contrast toward a predetermined target contrast level (*Steinberg: pars. 0012-0014*);

adjusting image sharpness toward a predetermined target sharpness level (*Steinberg: par. 0031*); and

masking with a shape selected from a set comprising ovals and outlines of a bust (*Steinberg: par. 0031*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention were made to combine the teachings of Steinberg with the method of Barkley and Lee in order to provide an automated color correction mechanism to correct differences between the reference colors in a color chart (*Steinberg: par. 0014*).

Art Unit: 2174

23. **Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Barkley as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Bhetanabhotla et al., (“Bhetanabhotla,” US 2002/0167538).

- **Regarding claim 9**, Barkley teaches the graphical user interface of claim 8, but does not explicitly disclose the first display region is reduced in size until activated by the user, and the first display region is increased in size upon activation.

However, Bhetanabhotla teaches a method comprising flexible organization of information using multiple hierarchical categories (*Bhetanabhotla: pars. 0106-0109; Fig. 1; categories 110 contains the category hierarchies used for categorization of the information items are displayed*) wherein the first display region is reduced in size until activated by the user, and the first display region is increased in size upon activation (*Bhetanabhotla: par. 0066; Fig. 1; the information item is displayed on the area content 130*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Bhetanabhotla with the method of Barkley in order to provide users with a means to share information right from out of one’s computer system while enforcing permissions and monitoring activities (*Bhetanabhotla: par. 0031*).

24. **Claims 11, 28-32, 40, 42, 45-47, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hildebrand et al., (“Hildebrand,” US 2004/0103202) in view of Sekiguchi, (US 6,711,687), and further in view of Hayes Jr., (“Hayes,” US 6,205,476).

- **Regarding claim 11**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 45.

Hildebrand further teaches the set of individual users consists of: the set of users who have any access privilege at all for the document (*Hildebrand: par. 0135; Fig. 5B.1; user A has all access permissions, user B has only open and print permissions, and users in user group C have open, edit, write, and download permissions for the document*); and the set of users who have accessed the document in the past although they currently are without any access privilege for the document (*Hildebrand: pars. 0073, 0102, and 0135; a system administrator is able to change access privilege of a user at any time using administration interface 506*).

- **Regarding claim 28**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 45.

Hildebrand further teaches the time of the most recent access by the user (*Hildebrand: pars. 0013-0016*);

Sekiguchi further teaches the time of the most recent write access by the user (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document*); and current privileges the user has for the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55*).

The motivation to combine the teaching of Sekiguchi with the system of Hildebrand and Hayes is the same motivation mentioned in claim 45.

- **Regarding claim 29**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 45.

Hayes further teaches a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user (*Hayes: col. 14, lines 10-31; Fig. 8; a desktop object uses the applet information to build a folder for the applets and to generate a window displaying the icons and the user friendly name for each applet to which the user has access; Figs. 12-24*).

The motivation to combine the teaching of Hayes with the system of Hildebrand and Sekiguchi is the same motivation mentioned in claim 45.

- **Regarding claim 30**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 46.

Hildebrand further teaches the set of users who have any access privilege at all for the document (*Hildebrand: par. 0135; Fig. 5B.1; user A has all access permissions, user B has only open and print permissions, and users in user group C have open, edit, write, and download permissions for the document*); and the set of users who have accessed the document in the past although they currently are without any access privilege for the document (*pars. 0073, 0102, and 0135; a system administrator is able to change access privilege of a user at any time using administration interface 506*).

- **Regarding claim 31**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 46,

Sekiguchi further teaches graphical representations of users are sorted by one or more of the following attributes: the time of the most recent access by the user

Art Unit: 2174

(Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document);

the time of the most recent write access by the user *(Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55);* and

current privileges the user has for the document *(Sekiguchi: pars. 0013-0016).*

The motivation to combine the teaching of Sekiguchi with the system of Hildebrand and Hayes is the same motivation mentioned in claim 46.

- **Regarding claim 32,** Hildebrand, Sekiguchi and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 46.

Hayes further teaches a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user *(Hayes: col. 14, lines 10-31; Fig. 8; a desktop object uses the applet information to build a folder for the applets and to generate a window displaying the icons and the user friendly name for each applet to which the user has access; Figs. 12-24).*

The motivation to combine the teaching of Hayes with the system of Hildebrand and Sekiguchi is the same motivation mentioned in claim 46.

- **Regarding claim 40,** Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 30.

Hayes further teaches a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user *(Hayes: col. 14, lines 10-31; Fig. 8; a desktop object uses the applet information to build a folder for the applets and to*

generate a window displaying the icons and the user friendly name for each applet to which the user has access; Figs. 12-24).

The motivation to combine the teaching of Hayes with the system of Hildebrand and Sekiguchi is the same motivation mentioned in claim 46.

- **Regarding claim 42**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes teach the graphical user interface of claim 31.

Hayes further teaches a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user (*Hayes: col. 14, lines 10-31; Fig. 8; a desktop object uses the applet information to build a folder for the applets and to generate a window displaying the icons and the user friendly name for each applet to which the user has access; Figs. 12-24.*

The motivation to combine the teaching of Hayes with the system of Hildebrand and Sekiguchi is the same motivation mentioned in claim 46.

- **Regarding claim 45**, Hildebrand teaches a visual display unit which displays a graphical user interface for representing access log information and access control settings for a single specific predetermined digital document (*pars. 0108-0109; Figs. 2*) comprises:

a display region containing a graphical representation of a set comprising one or more individual users, and wherein each of the individual users is graphically represented essentially at most one time by a visual element (*pars. 0108-0109; Fig. 2D; AmdGrp GUI 275*) which comprises:

a representation of the identity of the individual (*par. 0102; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user A has read permission to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1*);

a differing visual element for indicating if the user for the single specific predetermined digital document has privilege different than having read privilege (*pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; such as user A may be an executive or a branch supervisor who has all the access privileges to any secured documents, user B has limited access privileges while everyone in user group C shares the same access privileges; pars. 0102 and 0108-0109; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user D has read and write permissions to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1*);

indication whether there has been any access at all by the user to the document (*pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; see also pars. 0102, 0108-0109, and 0135; Figs. 2C.1, 2D, and 5B.1*).

Hildebrand teaches all limitations as recited above, but does not disclose one or more of the following elements representation of the time of the most recent read access by the user to the document; representation of the time of the most recent write access by the user to the document; indication whether the most recent write access by the user to the document is the most recent write access by any user to the document; indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the document has been before the most recent write access by any user to the document.

However, Sekiguchi teaches a security monitoring apparatus based on access log including one or more of the following elements:

representation of the time of the most recent read access by the user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

representation of the time of the most recent write access by the user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

indication whether the most recent write access by the user to the document is the most recent write access by any user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the document has been before the most recent write access by any user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Sekiguchi with the method of Hildebrand in order to provide a security monitoring system that performs more powerful maintenance and management of security (*Sekiguchi: col. 2, lines 6-12*).

Sekiguchi and Hildebrand teach all limitations as recited above, but do not explicitly disclose the resource is a digital document.

However, Hayes teaches a system with a network interconnecting a server and a plurality of user stations wherein the resource is a digital document (*Hayes: col. 3, lines 38-45; uses a unique identifier to access the file; which is known as a digital document,*

from the server; Figs. 13-22; showing one or more display regions; such as a content of resource is displayed on the left panel).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayes with the graphical user interface of Sekiguchi and Hildebrand in order to provide users with means for allowing an administrator to configure a user application by running the application directly in the context of a user or user group, rather than in the context of the administrator and allowing administrators to configure an end user application directly by effectively running the end user application while posing as a user or as a user group. (*Hayes: col. 4, lines 25-28 and lines 53-55*).

- **Regarding claim 46**, Hildebrand teaches a visual display unit which displays a graphical user interface for representing content, access log information, and access control settings for a specific predetermined visual digital document (*pars. 0108-0109; Figs. 2*) comprising:

- a display region containing a graphical representation of a set comprising a plurality of individual users wherein each of the individual users is graphically represented essentially at most one time by a visual element (*pars. 0108-0109; Fig. 2D; AmdGrp GUI 275*) which comprises:

- a representation of the identity of the individual user (*par. 0102; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user A has read permission to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1*);

- a differing visual element for indicating if the user for the document has privilege different than having read privilege (*pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; such as user A may be an executive or a branch supervisor who has all the access privileges to any secured*

Art Unit: 2174

documents, user B has limited access privileges while everyone in user group C shares the same access privileges; pars. 0102 and 0108-0109; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user D has read and write permissions to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1);

indication whether there has been any access at all by the user to the document (*pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; see also pars. 0102, 0108-0109, and 0135; Figs. 2C.1, 2D, and 5B.1).*

Hildebrand teaches all limitations as recited above, but does not disclose one or more of the following elements representation of the time of the most recent read access by the user to the document; representation of the time of the most recent write access by the user to the document; indication whether the most recent write access by the user to the document is the most recent write access by any user to the document; indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the document has been before the most recent write access by any user to the document.

However, Sekiguchi teaches a security monitoring apparatus based on access log including one or more of the following elements:

representation of the time of the most recent read access by the user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10);*

representation of the time of the most recent write access by the user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10);*

indication whether the most recent write access by the user to the document is the most recent write access by any user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

indication whether the most recent read access by the user to the document has been before the most recent write access by any user to the document (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Sekiguchi with the method of Hildebrand in order to provide a security monitoring system that performs more powerful maintenance and management of security (*Sekiguchi: col. 2, lines 6-12*).

Sekiguchi and Hildebrand teach all limitations as recited above, but do not explicitly disclose the resource is a digital document; and a display region on the display unit for normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the specific predetermined visual digital document; wherein the display region for representation of the set of users and the display region for representation of the content of the document appear to the operator as an integrated graphical user interface.

However, Hayes teaches a system with a network interconnecting a server and a plurality of user stations wherein the resource is a digital document (*Hayes: col. 3, lines 38-45; uses a unique identifier to access the file (i.e., digital document), from the server; Figs. 13-22; showing one or more display regions; such as a content of resource is displayed on the left panel*); a display region on the display unit for normal size, legibly scaled, unabridged representation of the content of the specific predetermined visual

digital document (*Hayes: Figs. 13-22; showing one or more display regions; such as a content of resource is displayed on the left panel*); wherein the display region for representation of the set of users and the display region for representation of the resource appear to the operator as an integrated graphical user interface (*Hayes: col. 18, lines 34-55; Fig. 15; the content of the resource is displayed on the left side pane and the applet permissions 1518; col. 20, lines 37-64; ; Fig. 20-23; the information will be displayed on the right panel of the IBM window and the administrator can create new users and modify and delete existing users, as already discussed, without being in the context of a group or subgroup*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Hayes with the graphical user interface of Sekiguchi and Hildebrand in order to provide users with means for allowing an administrator to configure a user application by running the application directly in the context of a user or user group, rather than in the context of the administrator and allowing administrators to configure an end user application directly by effectively running the end user application while posing as a user or as a user group. (*Hayes: col. 4. lines 25-28 and lines 53-55*).

- **Regarding claim 47**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes disclose the visual display unit of claim 46.

Hayes further discloses the display region for representation of the set of users and the display region for representation of the content of the document are concurrently visible and are concurrently operable (*Hayes: col. 18, lines 34-55; Fig. 15; the content of the resource is displayed on the left side pane and the applet permissions 1518; col. 20,*

lines 37-64; ; Fig. 20-23; the information will be displayed on the right panel of the IBM window and the administrator can create new users and modify and delete existing users, as already discussed, without being in the context of a group or subgroup).

The motivation to combine the teaching of Sekiguchi with the system of Hildebrand and Hayes is the same motivation mentioned in claim 46.

- **Regarding claim 51**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes disclose the visual display unit of claim 40.

Hildebrand and Sekiguchi further disclose graphical representations of users are sorted by one or more of the following attributes:

the time of the most recent access by the user (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

the time of the most recent write access by the user (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*); and

current privileges the user has for the document (*Hildebrand: par. 0102; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user A has read permission to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1; Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*).

25. **Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes, as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Steinberg (US 2002/0141639).

- **Regarding claim 41**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes disclose the graphical user interface of claim 40.

Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes do not explicitly disclose the likeness comprises, at least in part, a digital photograph, processed by a method including at least one step selected from the set of: adjusting image color saturation toward a predetermined target saturation level; converting to grayscale; adjusting image brightness toward a predetermined target brightness level; adjusting image contrast toward a predetermined target contrast level; adjusting image sharpness toward a predetermined target sharpness level; and masking with a shape selected from a set comprising ovals and outlines of a bust.

However, Steinberg teaches a method for automated image correction for digital image acquisition wherein the likeness comprises, at least in part, a digital photograph (*Steinberg: par. 0001; method for transforming the colors in a digital image to a color corrected digital image*), processed by a method including at least one step selected from the set of:

adjusting image color saturation toward a predetermined target saturation level (*Steinberg: par. 0004; pars. 0015-0016*); converting to grayscale (*Steinberg: par. 0011*);

converting to grayscale (*Steinberg: par. 0011*);

adjusting image brightness toward a predetermined target brightness level (*Steinberg: pars. 0012-0014*);

adjusting image contrast toward a predetermined target contrast level (*Steinberg: pars. 0012-0014*);

adjusting image sharpness toward a predetermined target sharpness level
(*Steinberg: par. 0031*); and
masking with a shape selected from a set comprising ovals and outlines of a
bust (*Steinberg: pars. 0031 and 0044*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention were
made to combine the teachings of Steinberg with the method of Hildebrand, Sekiguchi,
and Hayes in order to an automated color correction mechanism to correct differences
between the reference colors in a color chart (*Steinberg: par. 0014*).

26. **Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Barkley and
Lee, as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Bhetanabhotla et al.,
("Bhetanabhotla," US 2002/0167538).

- **Regarding claim 43**, Barkley and Lee discloses the graphical user interface
of claim 38.

Barkley and Lee do not explicitly disclose the first display region is reduced
in size until activated by the user, and the first display region is increased in size upon
activation.

However, Bhetanabhotla teaches a method comprising flexible organization of
information using multiple hierarchical categories (*Bhetanabhotla: pars. 0106-0109; Fig.
1; categories 110 contains the category hierarchies used for categorization of the
information items are displayed*) wherein the first display region is reduced in size until
activated by the user, and the first display region is increased in size upon activation

(Bhetanabhotla: par. 0066; Fig. 1; the information item is displayed on the area content 130).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Bhetanabhotla with the method of Barkley and Lee in order to provide users with a means to share information right from out of one's computer system while enforcing permissions and monitoring activities (*Bhetanabhotla: par. 0031*).

27. **Claims 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes, as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of Lee et al., ("Lee," US 2004/0117194).

- **Regarding claim 48**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes discloses the visual display unit graphical user interface of claim 46.

Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, and Hayes do not explicitly disclose a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user.

However, in an analogous art, Lee discloses a network conferencing system, wherein a user is graphically represented by a display element comprising, at least in part, a likeness of the user (*par. 0017; Figs. 4A, 12, 14, and 18; attendance icons*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time invention were made to combine the teachings of Lee with the system and method of Hildebrand,

Sekiguchi, and Hayes to provide users with a mean for displaying attendance icon within a network conference (*Lee: par. 0017*).

- **Regarding claim 49**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, Hayes, and Lee disclose the visual display unit of claim 48.

Hildebrand and Hayes further disclose the set of individual users consists of: the set of users who have any access privilege at all for the document (*Hildebrand: pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; see also pars. 0102, 0108-0109, and 0135; Figs. 2C.1, 2D, and 5B.1; Hayes: col. 3, lines 38-45*); and the set of users who have accessed the document in the past although they currently are without any access privilege for the document (*Hildebrand: pars. 0108-0109 and 0138; Figs. 2D and 5B.1; users can be assigned to different access privileges; see also pars. 0102, 0108-0109, and 0135; Figs. 2C.1, 2D, and 5B.1; Hayes: col. 3, lines 38-45*).

- **Regarding claim 50**, Hildebrand, Sekiguchi, Hayes, and Lee disclose the visual display unit of claim 49.

Hildebrand and Sekiguchi further disclose graphical representations of users are sorted by one or more of the following attributes:

the time of the most recent access by the user (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; the security management unit 112 executes statistical process of the access log 201 to obtain security management information 203 which includes the most recent access to the document; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*);

Art Unit: 2174

the time of the most recent write access by the user (*Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*); and

current privileges the user has for the document (*Hildebrand: par. 0102; Figs. 2C.1 and 2D; user A has read permission to the document; see also par. 0135 and Fig. 5B.1; Sekiguchi: col. 5, lines 14-55; Figs. 3-5 and 7-10*).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LINH K. PHAM whose telephone number is (571)270-3230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30AM to 5:00PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doon Y. Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 2174

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174

/Linh K Pham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2174